

Mitigation Measures UT-6a, UT-6b, and UT-6c are available to reduce the severity of this effect. If coordination with all appropriate utility providers and local agencies to integrate with other construction projects and minimize disturbance to communities were successful under Mitigation Measure UT-6b, the effect would not be adverse.

CEQA Conclusion: Under this alternative, most features would avoid disrupting existing facilities by crossing over or under infrastructure. However, construction of facilities would conflict with existing utility facilities in some locations. Regional power transmission lines and one natural gas pipeline would require relocation. Because the relocation and potential disruption of utility infrastructure would be required, this impact would be significant.

Mitigation Measures UT-6a, UT-6b, and UT-6c are available to reduce these impacts through measures that could avoid disruption of utility infrastructure. The project proponents cannot ensure that all the appropriate utility providers and local agencies will coordinate efforts on other construction projects to minimize disturbance to communities. If such coordination does not occur, it would result in a significant impact in the form of disruptions to public utility service. Accordingly, this impact would be significant and unavoidable. If, however, coordination with all appropriate utility providers and local agencies to integrate with other construction projects and minimize disturbance to communities were successful under Mitigation Measure UT-6b, the impact would be less-than-significant.

Mitigation Measure UT-6a: Verify Locations of Utility Infrastructure

Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6a under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4.

Mitigation Measure UT-6b: Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or Minimizes Any Effect on Operational Reliability

Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6b under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4.

Mitigation Measure UT-6c: Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or Minimizes Any Effect on Worker and Public Health and Safety

Please see Mitigation Measure UT-6c under Impact UT-6 in the discussion of Alternative 4.

Impact UT-7: Effects on Public Services and Utilities as a Result of Operation and Maintenance of the Proposed Water Conveyance Facilities

NEPA Effects: Operation and maintenance activities would require minimal labor. Impacts under Alternative 4A would be identical to that under Alternative 4. Given the limited number of workers involved and the large number of work sites, it is not anticipated that routine operations and maintenance activities or major inspections would result in substantial demand for law enforcement, fire protection, or emergency response services. In addition, operation and maintenance would not place service demand on public schools or libraries. The operation and maintenance of the proposed water conveyance facilities would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities as a result of increased need for public services.

Potential effects associated with operation and maintenance of water conveyance facilities would be similar to those described under Alternative 4. Therefore, Alternative 4A would not result in physical effects associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities.

Operation and maintenance of Alternative 4A facilities would involve use of water for pressure washing intake screen panels and basic cleaning of building facilities and other equipment. Impacts would be identical to those under Alternative 4. The operation and maintenance of the proposed water conveyance facilities would not result in the need for new water supply entitlements, or require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Similar to Alternative 4, the operation and maintenance activities associated with the proposed water conveyance facilities would not be expected to generate solid waste such that there would be an increase in demand for solid waste management providers in the Plan Area and surrounding communities. Therefore, there would be no or minimal effect on solid waste management facilities.

As with Alternative 4, operation and maintenance of proposed water conveyance facilities under this alternative would require new transmission lines for intakes, pumping plants, operable barriers, boat locks, and gate control structures throughout the various proposed conveyance alignments and construction of project facilities. Points of interconnection would be located identically to Alternative 4.

Operation and maintenance activities associated with the proposed water conveyance facilities would not be expected to result in the disruption or relocation of utilities. Effects associated with energy demands of operation and maintenance of the proposed water conveyance facilities are addressed in Chapter 21, *Energy*.

Overall, operation and maintenance of the conveyance facilities under Alternative 4A would not result in adverse effects on service demands, water supply and treatment capacity, wastewater and solid waste facilities nor conflict with local and regional utility lines. There would not be an adverse effect.

CEQA Conclusion: Operation and maintenance activities associated with the Alternative 4A proposed water conveyance facilities would not result in the need for the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered government facilities from the increased need for public services; construction of new water and wastewater treatment facilities or generate a need for new water supply entitlements; generate solid waste in excess of permitted landfill capacity; or result in the disruption or relocation of utilities. The impact on public services and utilities would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Impact UT-8: Effects on Public Services and Utilities as a Result of Implementing the Proposed Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6–12, 15, and 16

NEPA Effects: Effects of Alternative 4A related to the potential for effects on public services and utilities from implementing applicable conservation and other stressor reductions would be similar to those described for Alternative 4. However, as described in Chapter 3, *Description of Alternatives*, Alternative 4A would restore up to 15,548 acres of habitat under Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6–10 as compared with 83,900 acres under Alternative 4. Environmental Commitments 11, 12, 15, and 16 would be implemented only at limited locations. Conservation Measures 2, 5, 13, 14, and 17–21 would not be implemented as part of this alternative. Therefore, the magnitude of effects under Alternative 4A would likely be smaller than those associated with Alternative 4.